Response to #12 - Oral Testimony Paul Ogasawara

Comment Number	Response	
Note: Mr. Ogasawara submitted three exhibits with his testimony. They are reproduced here as #12 Exhibit 1 , #12 Exhibit 2 , and #12 Exhibit 3 .		
12-A	Comment noted. The HOV lane approach to this project was chosen based on several traffic studies that conclude that HOV lanes are an effective way to reduce congestion, and based on the broad support in Sonoma County for HOV lanes. See response to 9-A	
12-B	See Section 2.4.1 in this environmental document for a more complete discussion of transportation funding in the Bay Area. Caltrans notes that the voters' initiative for a sales tax increase in Sonoma County was defeated in the March 2000 election.	
12-C	Caltrans agrees that the interrelation of investment in rail and highways is complicated. As the commenter points out, there is an opportunity for innovative thinking in planning for this investment. Regional plans and programs are developed by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission from the priority lists of local Congestion Management Agencies (CMAs).	
12-D	According to studies for this project, HOV lanes will be an effective way to reduce congestion.	
#12 – EXHIBIT 1		
12-E	The Sonoma County Transportation Authority, as the local CMA (Congestion Management Authority), is responsible for developing a list of project priorities for the county.	
12-F	See Section 3.14 for a discussion of Socioeconomic conditions in Sonoma County. Caltrans encourages investigations into all modes of transportation and rigorous studies comparing the cost-effectiveness of various alternatives. Regarding the challenges of transportation funding, Caltrans is not authorized to determine which major projects will receive federal and state transportation dollars.	
12-G	While the facilities cited are outside the project limits of the proposed project, they are being or will be studied as part of future projects, based on local priorities.	
12-H	[same text as comments 12-A and 12-B]	
12-I	Comment noted.	
12-J	Comment noted.	
12-K	Caltrans shares the commenter's concern for energy conservation.	
12-L	Caltrans also would like to see multimodal and alternative forms of transportation continue to receive the public's attention.	

Response to #12 - Oral Testimony (continued) Paul Ogasawara

Comment Number	Response
12-M	See Section 2.4.1 in this environmental document for a more complete discussion of transportation funding in the Bay Area.
12-N	Comment noted. The highway facilities described are outside the project limits of the proposed project.
12-0	Comment noted. The highway facilities described are outside the project limits of the proposed project.
12-P	Former Representative Bosco's plan was proposed almost a decade ago. Since the time of that bill, numerous public ballot initiatives have been placed before the voters in an effort to grapple with this region's transportation problems, although the consensus necessary to pass such local funding initiatives has not yet been achieved. In this period, considerable local, state and federal levels planning efforts have also been focused on addressing the transportation concerns plaguing Sonoma County. The project proposed in this ND/EA is but one such solution emerging from a complex transportation funding and planning process.
#12 – EXHIBIT 2	
12-Q	Comment noted. Caltrans is especially interested in discussions of Livable Communities that implement concepts such as reducing transportation distances for goods as well as for people.
12-R	Comment noted.
12-S	Caltrans agrees that clean, energy efficient transportation is a desirable element of California's future.
12-T	Comment noted.
12-U	Caltrans is committed to long-term consideration of the interrelation of growth and transportation.
12-V	Comment noted.
12-W	Comment noted.
12-X	Comments noted.

#12 - EXHIBIT 3